



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/805,755	03/22/2004	Shinji Kuno	6639P011	1246

7590 07/21/2009  
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP  
7th Floor  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER
----------

UNELUS, ERNEST

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2181

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/21/2009 PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/805,755	KUNO, SHINJI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	ERNEST UNELUS	2181	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ERNEST UNELUS. (3) Bill Schaal.  
 (2) Mr. Alford Kindred. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 July 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Higashida/Cloutier.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant explained the invention and specifically pointed the difference between the two processors and the separation of the streams that goes to each processor, which seems to be a key factor of the invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Alford W. Kindred/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2181
--	---